

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated July 24, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 24, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, the paragraph [0028] has been amended.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-15 and 17-22 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12-13 and 15 have been amended. Claim 16 has been canceled. The numbering of claim 22 has been corrected. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Claim Objections

Claim 21 is objected to because two claims have been numbered 21. Appropriate correction has been made.

Appropriate correction has been made: the second instance of claim 21 has been changed to claim 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 10-14 are not limited to tangible embodiments.

The Examiner takes the position that embodiments which included "wireless communications" constitute intangible embodiments, and that such intangible embodiments constitute non-statutory subject matter.

Accordingly, paragraph [0028] of the specification has been amended to remove reference to "wireless communications".

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pub. No. 2003/0037069, *Davidson* (hereinafter "*Davidson*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, Davison does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim". For example, Davison does not disclose a computer-implemented method for generating a transactional database statement based on an existing database statement, comprising generating the transactional database statement based on user input and identified fields from the existing database statement. In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner argues that Davison discloses generating the transactional database statement based on identified fields and user input at Davison [0068-0069]. However, the cited passage is in fact directed to manual composition of transactional database statements by an administrator prior to user input of a request to the system and without regard for identified fields from existing database statements. Davison's existing database statements are composed, either "free-style" or with a query design tool, and stored on the server (Davison [0069-0070]). A user can then make a request to the system which indicates which pre-generated database statement to retrieve from storage (Davison [0063] and [0068]). Davison does not disclose generating the transactional database statements based on user input and identified fields from the existing database statement, because Davison generates the database statements prior to the user input.

Therefore, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 is rejected on substantially the same grounds as claim 1. Since Davison does not disclose generating the transactional database statement based on user input and identified fields from the existing database statement for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, claim 10 and its dependents are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 is rejected on substantially the same grounds as claim 1. Since Davison does not disclose generating the transactional statement based on user input and identified fields from the existing database statement for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, claim 15 and its dependents are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan

Registration No. 44,227

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicant(s)